

Applicant hereby elects the claims of Group I (claims 1-28) without traverse. Applicant reserves the right to re-present the claims of the non-elected Group II (claims 29-32) by filing divisional applications directed thereto.

The Examiner states, "If applicant elected the Group I (Claims 1-28), the following election of species is required:

- a. The species I: claims related to the paragraph 4 on page 2;
- b. The species II: claims related to the paragraph 5 on page 2; and
- c. The species III: claims related to the paragraph 6 of page 3."

Applicant respectfully traverses. MPEP § 806.05 recites, "Where two or more related inventions are being claimed, the principal question to be determined in connection with a requirement to restrict or a rejection on the ground of double patenting is whether or not the inventions as claimed are distinct. ... If they are not distinct, restriction is never proper." In the Office Action of August 24, 2004, the Examiner has not given any indication of why the language of paragraphs 4, 5, and 6 on pages 2 and 3 of the Present Application recite distinct inventions. As such, the latter restriction requirement is improper.